

Exhibit No. ____ (Exh. EDH-9)
Dockets UE-190334/UG-190335/UE-190222
2019 Avista General Rate Case
Witness: Ezra D. Hausman, Ph.D.

**BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

Complainant,

v.

**AVISTA CORPORATION d/b/a
AVISTA UTILITIES,**

Respondent.

**DOCKETS UE-190334, UG-190335,
and UE-190222 (*Consolidated*)**

**EXHIBIT EDH-9 TO THE
RESPONSE TESTIMONY OF
EZRA D. HAUSMAN, PH.D.
ON BEHALF OF SIERRA CLUB**

October 3, 2019

**AVISTA CORP.
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

JURISDICTION:	WASHINGTON	DATE PREPARED:	07/30/2019
CASE NO.:	UE-190222-334/UG-190335	WITNESS:	Jason Thackston
REQUESTER:	Sierra Club	RESPONDER:	Darrell Soyars
TYPE:	Data Request	DEPT:	Environmental Compliance
REQUEST NO.:	SC 014 - REVISED	TELEPHONE:	(509) 495-2860
		EMAIL:	Darrell.soyars@avistacorp.com

REQUEST:

Mr. Thackston states on page 45, lines 17-19 of his direct testimony that "Talen analyzed Regional Haze requirements and determined that a final NOx Regional Haze solution would have required both Smart Burn and a SCR." Please provide the referenced analysis and any materials or presentations provided to the Colstrip owners pursuant thereto.

RESPONSE: (REVISED 07/30/2019)

As discussed by Mr. Thackston on page 45, lines 19-23, the reasoning for this determination was as follows:

The reason for this was that Smart Burn provides the first and easiest reduction of NOx by eliminating its up-front formation. By installing Smart Burn first and obtaining the necessary operating data, it would be possible to size a SCR appropriately. Furthermore, future chemical use in a SCR (ammonia) is reduced, and the incoming NOx is lower thus reducing O&M expense.

Please also see Avista's response to SC-DR-10, 12 and 13. No other analysis was undertaken by Avista.